

IN THE DRAWINGS

Please replace original drawings sheets 1-4 with new sheets 1-3, includes herewith. No new matter has been added. New Figure 5 has been added, without adding new matter, to overcome the objection to the drawings at page 4 of the office action. Withdrawal of the drawing objection is respectfully requested.

REMARKS

1. Claims 1 and 17-29 were pending. No claims have been cancelled. Claims 1, 17-19, 21-23, and 25-29 have been amended. Claims 31-46 have been added. Claims 30-39 have been added. Claims 1 and 17-39 are now pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

2. Objections

On pages 2-4 of the Office Action, the specification, title, drawings, and Claim 27 were objected to. The specification, title and Claim 27 have been amended to overcome the respective objections. New Figure 5 has been added in correspondence to changes made to the specification, without adding new matter, to overcome the objection to the drawings. Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

3. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and § 103(a)

Claims 1 and 17 and 21-24 were rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,415,336 to Sansone. Claims 18 and 25 were rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sansone in view of Beasley (US Publication No. 2002/0149195 A1). Claim 19 was rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sansone in view of Patton et al. (US Patent No. 6,503,329). Claim 20 was rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sansone in view of Versaci (US Patent No. 4,641,578). Claim 27-29 were rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Sansone in view of in view of Versaci, and further in view of Gastafson et al. (US Publication No. 2002/0025085 A1). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and requests consideration of the following.

No applied reference teaches the alternation of a selected cancellation mark, or altering a cancellation mark with customer-supplied information. Moreover, none of the references teach, alone or in combination, the limitations recited in independent claims 1, 30, and 36. As such, the independent claims, and claims respectively depending there from, are allowable.

4. Conclusion

a. The applied art does not teach, suggest, or imply the combinations of the recited elements in the pending independent claims, as amended. The Applicant respectfully submits that, as to the claims now pending, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been made out, or in the alternative, the pending claims avoid the rejections. As such, the Applicant respectfully maintains that the pending independent claims are allowable, as are the claims respectively depending therefrom. Accordingly, the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested. Allowance of Claims 1 and 17-39 at an early date is solicited.

b. In the event that the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application which could be clarified by a telephonic interview, the Examiner is

respectfully requested to initiate the same with the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 21st day of March 2005.

Respectfully submitted,



BRADLEY K. DESANDRO
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 34,521

LEWIS AND ROCA LLP
40 NORTH CENTRAL AVENUE
Suite 1900
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
Telephone: (602) 262-5743
Facsimile: (602) 734-3770